

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Reginald Brown, #2531,	)	C/A No. 3:07-3508-JFA-JRM
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	REPORT AND
	)	RECOMMENDATION
Mr. NFN Trap, Nurse;	)	
Mr. NFN DJ, Nurse;	)	
Ms. NFN Clark, Nurse,	)	
Defendant.	)	

---

The plaintiff, Reginald Brown (“Plaintiff”), proceeding *pro se*, brings this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff is an involuntarily committed patient under the South Carolina Sexually Violent Predator’s law, in the custody of the South Carolina Department of Mental Health. Plaintiff files this action *in forma pauperis* pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. The complaint statement of claims alleges, verbatim and in its entirety, that “on or round 7-8-06 Defendants gave Plaintiff someone else medication, and Plaintiff sick, throwing up blood, and had to be hospitalized.” The complaint seeks a declaratory judgment, monetary damages, and injunctive relief. Specifically, the relief section requests that the defendants lose their jobs, medical licenses, and that they be sent to prison. The complaint should be dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

*Pro Se and In Forma Pauperis Review*

Under established local procedure in this judicial district, a careful review has been made

---

<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1)(B), and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d), D.S.C., the undersigned is authorized to review such complaints for relief and submit findings and recommendations to the District Court.

of the *pro se* complaint herein pursuant to the procedural provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915. This review has been conducted in light of the following precedents: *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324-25 (1989); *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97 (1976); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); and *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir.), *cert. denied*, 439 U.S. 970 (1978).

The complaint herein has been filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, which permits an indigent litigant to commence an action in federal court without paying the administrative costs of proceeding with the lawsuit. To protect against possible abuses of this privilege, the statute allows a district court to dismiss the case upon a finding that the action “fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted” or is “frivolous or malicious.” § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i), (ii). A finding of frivolity can be made where the complaint “lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact.” *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 31 (1992). Hence, under § 1915(e)(2)(B), a claim based on a meritless legal theory may be dismissed *sua sponte*. *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319 (1989); *Allison v. Kyle*, 66 F.3d 71 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1995).

This Court is required to liberally construe *pro se* documents, *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97 (1976), holding them to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys, *Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 9 (1980) (*per curiam*). Even under this less stringent standard, however, the *pro se* complaint is subject to summary dismissal. The mandated liberal construction afforded to *pro se* pleadings means that if the court can reasonably read the pleadings to state a valid claim on which the plaintiff could prevail, it should do so, but a district court may not rewrite a petition to include claims that were never presented, *Barnett v. Hargett*, 174 F.3d 1128, 1133 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1999), or construct the plaintiff’s legal arguments for him, *Small v. Endicott*, 998 F.2d 411, 417-18 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1993), or “conjure up questions never squarely presented” to the court, *Beaudett v. City of Hampton*, 775 F.2d 1274, 1278 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1985), *cert. denied*, 475 U.S. 1088 (1986).

### Discussion

The complaint is filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, which ““is not itself a source of substantive rights,’ but merely provides ‘a method for vindicating federal rights elsewhere conferred.”” *Albright v. Oliver*, 510 U.S. 266, 271 (1994), quoting *Baker v. McCollan*, 443 U.S. 137, 144, n. 3 (1979). A legal action under § 1983 allows “a party who has been deprived of a federal right under the color of state law to seek relief.” *City of Monterey v. Del Monte Dunes at Monterey, Ltd.*, 526 U.S. 687, 707 (1999). To state a claim under § 1983, a plaintiff must allege two essential elements: (1) that a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States was violated, and (2) that the alleged violation was committed by a person acting under the color of state law. *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988). Thus, a § 1983 action may not be based only on a violation of state law or on a state tort.<sup>2</sup> *Clark v. Link*, 855 F.2d 156, 161 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1988).

Conduct that is intentionally harmful to involuntarily committed mental patients may state a claim for violation of substantive due process under the Fourteenth Amendment. *Patten v. Nichols*, 274 F.3d 829, 833-34 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2001). The conduct must “shock the conscience” because “only the most egregious, arbitrary governmental conduct” violates substantive due process. *Id.* The statement of claim portion of the complaint in this case simply states “on or round 7-8-06 Defendants gave Plaintiff someone else medication, and Plaintiff sick, throwing up blood, and had to be hospitalized.” Compl. at 3. The facts alleged do not indicate the defendants acting intentionally to harm Plaintiff. Mere mistake or carelessness does not state a claim for violation of constitutional rights. *See County of Sacramento v. Lewis*, 523 U.S. 833, 849 (1998)(“[L]iability for

---

<sup>2</sup> Claims based only on state law could be cognizable in this Court under the diversity statute but only if that statute's requirements are satisfied. The diversity statute requires complete diversity of parties and an amount in controversy in excess of seventy-five thousand dollars (\$75,000.00). *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a). The parties do not have complete diversity in this case.

negligently inflicted harm is categorically beneath the threshold of constitutional due process.”).

The law is well settled that negligence, in general, is not actionable under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

*See Daniels v. Williams*, 474 U.S. 327, 328-336 & n. 3 (1986); *Davidson v. Cannon*, 474 U.S. 344, 345-348 (1986); *Ruefly v. Landon*, 825 F.2d 792, 793-794 (4th Cir. 1987); and *Pink v. Lester*, 52 F.3d 73 (4th Cir. 1995)(applying *Daniels v. Williams* and *Ruefly v. Landon*: "The district court properly held that *Daniels* bars an action under § 1983 for negligent conduct[.]"). Similarly, medical malpractice, a state tort, is not actionable under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. at 106 (medical malpractice is not a constitutional violation). Because negligence and medical malpractice are not constitutional violations and do not state a claim under § 1983, the complaint should be dismissed.

Recommendation

Accordingly, it is recommended that the District Judge dismiss the complaint in this case *without prejudice* and without issuance and service of process. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) [district court may dismiss at any time if complaint fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted]. The plaintiff's attention is directed to the notice on the following page.

s/Joseph R. McCrorey  
United States Magistrate Judge

December 14, 2007  
Columbia, South Carolina

**Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation**

The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Court Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. In the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must “only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005).

Specific written objections must be filed within ten (10) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The time calculation of this ten-day period excludes weekends and holidays and provides for an additional three (3) days for filing by mail. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a) & (e). Filing by mail pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

Larry W. Propes, Clerk  
United States District Court  
901 Richland Street  
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

**Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation.** 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985).